DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 263 SO 007 958

AUTHOR Olmo, Barbara G.
TITLE Values Education in the New Jersey Secondary Curriculum.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 11p.; A related document is SO 007 844

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior; *Changing Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; Curriculum Development; Department Directors (School); Educational Research; Educational Trends; High School Curriculum; *Humanistic Education; Longitudinal Studies; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; *Values
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The status of the affective domain in the secondary social studies curriculum in New Jersey is reported as part of a follow-up study. Qestionnaires administered to principals, social studies teachers, and department heads in 50 public senior high schools in 1964 were re-administered in 1974. Results on the following topics are reviewed: the focus of revision and student attitudes, aspects of value education, and the nature of secondary curriculum revision. The emphasis on structuring the curriculum through interrelated concepts and organizing subject matter to include behavioral sciences as seen in the last decade is reflected in the questionnaire responses. The data show that there is much uniformity of response to various aspects of values education. A number of teachers and department heads responded that specific values, morals, and attitudes should be taught as part of the social studies curriculum. Relatively few educators reported increased attention to the affective domain in classroom interaction. (Author/KSM)

ED 099263

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VALUES EDUCATION IN THE NEW JERSEY SECONDARY CURRICULUM

Dr. Barbara G. Olmo

SP 007 955

ED 099263

SP 007 958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Values Education
in the New Jersey Secondary Curriculum

What is the status of the affective domain, or the realm of attitudes, beliefs, and values in the secondary social studies curriculum in New Jersey? Part of a follow-up study conducted ten years after initial research for Rutgers, The State University, this question was pursued because of increased attention to values education among social studies educators.[1]

In 1964, a random selection of 50 schools was made from the 253 New Jersey public senior high schools listed in the New Jersey Department of Education Directory. From a review of the pertinent literature concerning variables related to curriculum revision, questionnaires were devised for principals, social studies teachers and department heads. Responses were received from 41 staffs, or 82 per cent of the surveyed schools.

In 1974, questionnaires were mailed to the 41 schools whose staffs participated in the earlier study. Only one school had closed within that period, leaving 40 schools to be surveyed. Of that number 98 per cent of the staffs responded.

Social studies teachers from 90 per cent of the surveyed schools responded and 73 per cent of the social studies department heads completed questionnaires.

TABLE 1

Percentages of Responses of
Social Studies Teachers and Department Chairmen Concerning
The Focus of Revision and Student Attitudes

	Social Studies Teachers N=94	Department Chairmen N=29
1. In your system, what has been the focus of revision in social studies?		
(a) cognitive areas (facts)	4	3
(b) affective areas (attitudes, values, or beliefs)	32	18
(c) some combination of (a) and (b)	60	79
(d) No answer	4	-
2. In the past ten years (if you have been teaching that long), what changes in attitudes towards the government of the United States have you notices among your students?		
(a) positive/optimistic	1	-
(b) negative/pessimistic, skeptical, distrustful, suspicious)	48[a]	16[b]
(c) apathetic or ambiguous	22	4
(d) combination of (b) and (c)	10	8
(e) No answer	19	1

[a]One teacher wrote, "They are becoming more like their parents.

[b]One department chairman said, "They are becoming negative to a dangerous degree. Another chairman stated, "[This trend towards negative attitudes] is a natural enough development.

Focus of Revision

Table 1 shows that teachers and department heads report more emphasis in curriculum revision has occurred in the affective domain, rather than in the cognitive. However, the major focus of revision has occurred in a combination of both domains. Several educators volunteered the information that the emphasis has been on concepts, both cognitive and affective, rather than on fact-learning, per se. That is, responses reflect that educators have moved towards interrelating facts into concepts and generalizations in the spirit of "seeing how things relate."[2]

By far, most educators revealed their students' attitudes toward the United States government has grown more negative, shifting to apathetic as their feeling of futility grew.

Aspects of Values Education

The work of Lawrence Kohlberg[3] is based on at least five assumptions about which educators were asked to indicate degrees of agreement. Table 2 indicates that more respondants disagreed with, or agreed to a lesser degree, the fourth assumption, "The nature and order of moral stages is the same for everyone despite cultural differences (but the rate of development differs)." The participants agreed, for the most part, with the other assumptions.

Very striking is the uniformity of responses to various aspects of values education. A surprising number of teachers and department heads seemed to think that [in item (f)] specific values, morals, and attitudes should be taught as part of the social studies curriculum. Some interpretations of this uniformity of responses are (1) this section [items (a)

TABLE 2

Percentages of Responses of
Social Studies Teachers and Department Chairmen Concerning
Aspects of Values Education

	Social Studies Teachers N=94	Department Chairmen N=29
1. Recently, research has been done by Lawrence Kohlberg concerning moral stage development, one aspect of values education. His work is based on several assumptions. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with these assumptions.		
(a) A child's moral development occurs in stages.		
(1) a great deal	28	24
(2) a good deal	34	42
(3) a moderate degree	20	17
(4) a slight degree	5	-
(5) disagree	3	-
(6) no answer	10	17
(b) Moral growth may be viewed as the development of a sense of fairness.		
(1) a great deal	17	24
(2) a good deal	34	28
(3) a moderate degree	28	28
(4) a slight degree	6	3
(5) disagree	4	-
(6) no answer	11	17
(c) The movement from stage to stage is a long-term process and it is not automatic.		
(1) a great deal	31	38
(2) a good deal	33	28
(3) a moderate degree	18	10
(4) a slight degree	4	3
(5) disagree	3	-
(6) no answer	11	21
(d) The nature and order of moral stages is the same for everyone despite cultural differences (but the rate of development differs.)		
(1) a great deal	5	3
(2) a good deal	18	7
(3) a moderate degree	16	38
(4) a slight degree	15	7
(5) disagree	37	24
(6) no answer	9	21
(e) The teacher should stimulate students to think by "evoking disequilibrium" about their views (making them aware of value conflicts)		
(1) great deal	40	42
(2) a good deal	28	26
(3) a moderate degree	19	3
(4) a slight degree	-	7
(5) disagree	2	3
(6) no answer	11	17

through (h)] was ambiguous, (2) respondants grew weary of the four-page questionnaire, and/or (3) participants saw no real or important differences in these aspects of values education. Many respondants reported a lack of understanding of moral stage reasoning, item (h), as well as a lack of familiarity with Kohlberg's work.

Much of the literature in current social studies education encourages the idea that the curriculum should include teaching students to (1) analyze value judgments (one's own and others' value judgments); (2) clarify values in conflict through various, appropriate strategies; (3) distinguish value judgments from judgments about matters of fact; and (4) distinguish fact from opinion. However, much controversy exists concerning the teaching of specific values, morals, and ethics (whether overtly or in a "hidden curriculum") or teaching to improve a stage of moral reasoning. The obvious questions, "whose values?" and "to what end should stages of moral reasoning be 'improved'?" make these issues controversial. Yet only a few respondants asked these questions.

Priorities in Curriculum Revision

Table 3 reveals that revision has occurred by (1) enriching courses with additional topics and/or units (micro-units), (2) enriching courses with supplementary materials, (3) working with consultants and in-service meetings, and (4) revising towards a problem-solving approach.

While individual respondants reported that their personal revision took the focus of increased student involvement and emphasis of concepts more than mere retention of facts, relatively few educators included increased attention to the affective domain.

TABLE 2, CONTINUED

	Social Studies Teachers N=94	Department Chairmen N=29
2. Please indicate the degree to which you think each of these should be taught as part of the social studies curriculum, Grades 10, 11, or 12.		
(a) Teaching values judgment analysis (students' and others' values judgments)		
(1) a great deal	32	48
(2) a good deal	27	28
(3) a moderate degree	9	3
(4) a slight degree	1	-
(5) should not be taught	1	-
(6) no answer	30	21
(b) Teaching values conflict clarification		
(1) a great deal	23	42
(2) a good deal	33	31
(3) a moderate degree	11	3
(4) a slight degree	1	-
(5) should not be taught	-	-
(6) no answer	32	24
(c) Teaching to distinguish value judgment from judgments about matters of fact		
(1) a great deal	33	48
(2) a good deal	29	25
(3) a moderate degree	6	3
(4) a slight degree	2	-
(5) should not be taught	1	-
(6) no answer	29	24
(d) Teaching principles of morals		
(1) a great deal	14	38
(2) a good deal	23	21
(3) a moderate degree	17	7
(4) a slight degree	7	7
(5) should not be taught	5	3
(6) no answer	34	24

TABLE 2, CONTINUED

	Social Studies Teachers N=94	Department Chairmen N=29
(e) Teaching principles of moral reasoning.		
(1) a great deal	20	45
(2) a good deal	25	24
(3) a moderate degree	15	7
(4) a slight degree	3	-
(5) should not be taught	4	-
(6) no answer	33	24
(f) Teaching specific values, morals, ethics.		
(1) a great deal	11	24
(2) a good deal	22	32
(3) a moderate degree	15	14
(4) a slight degree	10	3
(5) should not be taught	9	3
(6) no answer	33	24
(g) Teaching to distinguish fact from opinion (students' opinions and others')		
(1) a great deal	36	55
(2) a good deal	28	21
(3) a moderate degree	4	-
(4) a slight degree	1	-
(5) should not be taught	-	-
(6) no answer	31	24
(h) Teaching to improve a student's stage of moral reasoning.		
(1) a great deal	17	28
(2) a good deal	26	31
(3) a moderate degree	15	7
(4) a slight degree	4	-
(5) should not be taught	1	-
(6) no answer	37	34

TABLE 3

Percentages of Responses of Teachers and Department Heads Concerning the Nature of Their Secondary Curriculum Revision

	Social Studies Teachers N=94	Department Heads N=29
1. Which methods of curriculum revision best apply for your high school? [a]		
(a) enriching existing courses with additional topics and/or units.	43	41
(b) revising towards an increasing problem-approach or topical approach.	62	36
(c) calling in curriculum consultants	14	12
(d) enriching existing courses with supplementary materials, such as paperback books, films, or maps.	59	57
(e) working on revision through in-service meetings.	40	35
(f) assigning committees to work on revision.	24	36
(g) summer workshops.	2	2
2. What changes have you made in your own teaching? [b]		
(a) emphasize concepts, more than retention of facts, alone.	33	28
(b) increased attention to affective domain.	4	14
(c) emphasize increased student involvement.	33	52
(d) increased use of inquiry techniques.	24	7
(e) focus on non-West and ethnic studies.	-	7
(f) updated and upgraded content & process.	3	-
(g) return to traditional approaches.	2	-

[a] Participants could indicate more than one response for each item.

[b] Participants wrote in their own answers to this question.

Conclusion

Literature in social studies education in the past decade has emphasized structuring the curriculum through interrelated concepts, broadening focus to include non-Western area studies, and organizing subject matter to include behavioral sciences. The status of the New Jersey secondary social studies curriculum reflects this concern. With increasing attention being afforded the affective domain, or values education, another investigation of the curriculum will be warranted to see the impact of theory on practice. Further research is needed to determine the degree to which educators are aware of differences within values education. Not to report seeing a difference between teaching about values and teaching specific values is a serious revelation, worthy of further purpsuit.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Barbara G. Olmo, "Curriculum Reform in New Jersey: A Decade Later," Research in Education (ERIC), 1975; Lawrence E. Metcalf, Editor. Values Education, Forty-first Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1971; Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum. Values Clarification. New York: Hart, 1972; Fred M. Newmann and Donald Oliver. Clarifying Public Controversy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970; David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives; Handbook II, Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1964, pp. 49-53; Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. Values and Teaching. Boston: Merrill, 1966; and Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies, 2nd Edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1968 (chapter 6).

[2]Jerome S. Bruner. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

[3]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Development and the New Social Studies." Social Education (May, 1973), pp. 369-375; "A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." The Humanist (November/December, 1972; and with Phillip Whitten, "Understanding the Hidden Curriculum," Learning (December, 1972), pp. 10-14)

[4]Barbara G. Olmo, " A Process of Values Analysis," The Social Studies. (1975); see also, Jack R. Fraenkel's Helping Students Think and Value: Strategies for Teaching the Social Studies. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.